

REMARKS

Claims 1-10, 16-20 and 22 are pending. By this Amendment, the specification and claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 16 and 22 are amended, and claims 11-15 and 21 are canceled, without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. No new matter is added.

Applicants note with appreciation the withdrawal of all prior grounds of rejection in favor of new grounds.

The specification is amended to remedy several minor informalities and to conform the specification to the drawings. No new matter is added.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,128,655 to Fields et al. (Fields). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 16 and 22 are amended to clarify and specify the nature of the "client" recited in the claims, namely a referring client. Furthermore, claims 1 and 6 are amended to clarify and specify that the creation of the skeleton/virtual content and the determining of the merged content portion are both automated. Support for these changes can be found, for example, in Fig. 1 and in the specification in paragraphs [0005], [0009], [0012], [0020].

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "a system for managing identity information in a merged content portion, comprising an identity storage that stores identity information including content elements and style sheet information, associated with a plurality of referring clients and a user; ... a skeleton/virtual content determining circuit that determines which of the stored identity information and the style sheet information correspond to the particular referring client and the user to automatically create a skeleton/virtual content record based on the determined stored identity information and style sheet information; ... and a merging circuit that automatically determines the merged content portion based on the information

received from the information provider and the created skeleton/virtual content record ... , the created second object is outputted to the particular referring client and the user, maintaining a look and feel of a referring client website." Independent claim 6 is similar and directed to a method.

Fields recasts desired elements from a web-based content in the context of a single host site so as to preserve the look and feel of the host site (Abstract, col. 3, lines 6 and 7, col. 4, lines 31-33, and Figs. 1, 2 of Fields). That is, Fields essentially teaches a one-to-many relationship between the single host site (referring client) and the plurality of web content clients (users) so that each client will preserve the look of the host site .

Claims 1 and 6 include a plurality of referring client websites (such as websites 600-800 in Fig. 1). Applicants manage identity information and identity style sheets for each referring web site collectively in an identity storage device (element 200 in Figs. 1, 3 and 4) and determine an appropriate style sheet based on the referring website (paragraphs [0016], [0018], [0030], and [0031]). With this, Applicants may keep track of the plurality of possible referring client web sites so that each may have its requested content information downloaded from a service provider and presented with the look and feel of a particular referring client web site.

Fields does not appreciate this problem with managing a plurality of style sheets for a plurality of referring client sites and instead teaches that each host site has its own template that is applied to all clients (users). Thus, there is no need for an identity storage that stores stylesheets for a plurality of referring client web sites as recited in claims 1 and 6. Moreover, Fields does not teach the recited skeleton virtual content determining circuit that determines which among the plurality of style sheets corresponds to the particular referring client web site. The alleged "registering" referred to on page 4 of the Office Action is the registration of each of the plurality of web content client web sites and not the host site (or a referring

client)(col. 6, line 64 - col. 7, line 2). That is, because there is only a single host in each embodiment of Fields, there is no need to register or determine a particular style sheet associated with a particular referring website. Moreover, Fields teaches against individual websites having their own look and feel (col. 2, lines 3-15).

Because Fields fails to teach each and every feature of independent claims 1 and 6, these claims and claims dependent therefrom define over Fields and contain allowable subject matter.

Moreover, regarding dependent claims 3 and 8, the determining circuit determines a referring client identification based on Internet protocol address, etc. and indexes the stored identification information by the client identification. Fields' template relates to the sole host site and thus has no need to index storage by referring client identification. Accordingly, dependent claims 3 and 8 separately distinguish over Fields.

Independent claim 16 specifies that the identity storage includes a client identifier portion and an associated content element portion (for example, portions 910 and 920 in Applicants' Figs. 6-7). Independent claim 22 is similar and directed to a method.

Because the host site in Fields has its own template, there is no motivation to provide a client identifier portion or any need to determine a style sheet based on the client identifier portion, as recited in independent claims 16 and 22. Although a user may manually change the look by changing a template (col. 9, lines 1-12 of Fields), this requires user interaction and is thus not automatic.

Accordingly, because Fields fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claims 16 and 22, these claims and claims dependent therefrom define over Fields and contain allowable subject matter.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Stephen P. Catlin
Registration No. 36,101

JAO:SPC/jnm

Date: August 31, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

| |
|--|
| <p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037</p> |
|--|